



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,153	10/28/2003	Eric M. Lunsford	PALM-0933	6590
30554	7590	03/15/2007	EXAMINER	
SHEMWELL MAHAMEDI LLP 4880 STEVENS CREEK BOULEVARD SUITE 201 SAN JOSE, CA 95129			MYERS, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2111	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	03/15/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/696,153	LUNSFORD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Paul R. Myers	2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10,30,31,34-37,39 and 43-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 9,10,30,31,36,37,39,52-59 and 66-70 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8,34,35,43,44,51 and 60-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 45-50 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 30, 31, 34-37, 39, and 43-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 3, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Olson et al PN 6,453,378.

In regards to claims 1, 44: Olson et al teaches A method for operating a portable computing device, the method comprising: while the portable computing device (110) is operational for a user (detects a docking event while powered up Column 5 lines 13-42), detecting that an external computing device (112) is actively connected (714) to

communicate transfer data (Column 4 lines 25-26) and provide power (Column 4 lines 24-25) to the portable computing device (110); and responsive to detecting the external computing device (112), suspending execution of at least a portion of a program that would otherwise reduce a power consumption of the portable computing device after a given duration of inactivity (720 see also abstract).

In regards to claim 3: Olson et al teaches transmitting one or more communications from the portable computing device using the external computing device (the external device includes network cards).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 6, 43, 51, 60-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson et al PN 6,453,378 in view of Townsley et al PN 5,557,738.

In regards to claims 2, 6, 43, 51, 60, 64-65: Olson et al teaches deactivating the processor slowing power management routines. Olson does not teach the power management routines include a timeout feature. Townsley et al teaches the duration of inactivity is a time out feature for power management. It would have been obvious to have the processor of Olson et al include standard power management because this would have provided for greater battery life.

In regards to claims 61-62: Olson teaches a network card.

In regards to claim 63: Sakai et al teaches displaying information including such items as power mode, percent power of the battery etc. Sakai et al does not expressly teach that the displayed information can include such items as a world clock, digital images from a digital camera, and network data. It would have been obvious to allow displaying of any images accessed because this would have prevented limiting the functionality of the system.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson et al PN 6,453,378 in view of Kobayashi PN 5,463,742.

In regards to claim 4: Olson teaches detecting the docking event. Olson does not teach detecting the type of device to which it is docked. Kobayashi teaches a signal from the external computing device, and determining a type of external computing device using the signal (A type code is provided by each docking station and configures the PPM accordingly). It would have been obvious to include a signal line that indicated the type of device because this would have allowed for proper configuration.

7. Claims 5, 7-8, 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olson et al PN 6,453,378 in view of Townsley et al PN 5,557,738 as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Sakai et al PN 5,613,135.

In regards to claim 5: Olson teaches suspension of the power save mode. Olson however does not teach selective suspension of the power save mode. Sakai et al teaches

Art Unit: 2111

selective control of the power save mode (hot key etc). It would have been obvious to include selective control in the coupling function because this would have allowed for greater user power control.

In regards to claim 7: Sakai et al teaches a measurement of the voltage level (V) (Figure 21 into 74).

In regards to claim 8: Olson et al teaches a parallel connector in one embodiment but may be other type (Column 3 line 62-64). Official notice is taken that serial connectors are well known. It would have been obvious to use a serial connector because this would have decreased the number of pins and decreased cost of manufacturing.

In regards to claims 34-35: Sakai et al teaches displaying at maximum illumination when not in power save mode.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 9, 10, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 52-59 and 66-70 are allowable over the prior art.
9. Claim 45-50 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2111

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 571 272 3639. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (571) 272-3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
PAUL R. MYERS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

PRM  
March 9, 2007